

## Global evidence of gender equity in academic health research: a scoping review

### Summary

We conducted a scoping review to chart the global literature on gender equity (GE) within academic health research institutions. We identified 562 relevant quantitative studies that reported outcomes related to GE. Many studies, primarily within the US, were conducted without funding. The majority of studies used inappropriate classifications of sex and gender and failed to report on other individual characteristics that would facilitate an intersectional analysis. Most studies reported GE output measures related to surgery outcomes, publications or funding, however these measures lack standardization across studies.

### Implications

The results of this review can be used by researchers, academic, health care and policy professionals to inform future research and organizational priorities. There is a need for appropriate funding for this area of research, and a focus outside of the US. This scoping review highlights the current lack of standardized, appropriate definitions of sex and gender and reporting of other individual characteristics. This review highlights a need for future standardized GE output measures across institutions to address equity issues that impact gender minorities.

**Reference:** Tricco AC, Nincic V, Darvesh N, et al. Global evidence of gender equity in academic health research: a scoping review. *BMJ Open*. 2023 Feb 15;13(2):e067771.

**PMID:** [36792322](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36792322/)

For more information, please contact Dr. Andrea Tricco: [andrea.tricco@unityhealth.to](mailto:andrea.tricco@unityhealth.to)

### What is the current situation?

- The importance of gender and sex identity is widely known in health research. However, the complexities of sex and gender on a global scale that hinder career progression and contributions in science requires more attention.
- Further examination of GE within academic healthcare is required to deliver scientific excellence, quality, integrity and patient care.

### What is the objective?

- To conduct a scoping review to summarize the global literature of GE and interacting social identities within academic institutions among independent researchers who conduct health research.

### How was the review conducted?

- The JBI (formerly Joanna Briggs Institute) guidance to scoping reviews guided the conduct, whereas the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA ScR) was used to report this review.
- We searched MEDLINE, EMBASE, PsycINFO, Cochrane, JBI, Campbell and CINAHL database from inception to October 2019.
- Included studies were quantitative containing primary data reporting professional outcomes related to GE within academic institutions.
- Prevalence of each PROGRESS-PLUS variables was summarized; Place of residence, Race/Ethnicity/Culture/Language, Occupation, Gender/Sex, Religion, Education, Socioeconomic Status, and Social Capital.
- Additional PROGRESS-PLUS variables include age of faculty.
- Studies originated from North America reported PROGRESS-PLUS variables race, sex/gender, and religion.

### What did the review find?

- After screening 94,798 potentially relevant citations, we screened 4,753 studies at the full text level.
- 562 studies were included; in 6 languages and from 6 continents with the majority being from North America.
- 2966 outcomes were reported from the 562 studies. Outcomes include (but are not limited to): academic output, faculty workforce, academic activity, academic leadership, recruitment and retention, promotion, recognition.
- Most studies did not report the process of determining gender/sex; few studies reported using self-identification, databases and listings, and other methods. Only 10 studies reported on intersectionality of race and gender.
- The review found a lack of standardised methods, outcomes and definitions that would allow for meaningful comparison and evaluation of GE across institutions.